

REMARKS

This request is in response to the Official Action dated February 27, 2004. No amendments have been made. Claims 1-20 remain in the application with Claims 1, 5 and 7 being the only independent claims. Favorable reconsideration, in view of the accompanying remarks, is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 3 of the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 7, 9 and 11 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,807,682 to Catinella et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 defines the invention as a manually operated extraction device for use in a casting apparatus to remove a stuck cast part, the casting apparatus including a moveable mold section and a stationary mold section so that when the moveable mold section is in a closed position and in contact with the stationary mold section a part shape cavity is defined. The manually operated extraction device includes a manually operated extraction member disposed in the stationary mold section during the casting of a cast part. Claim 1 recites that the extraction member is disposed adjacent the part shape cavity and selectively moveable between a first position, wherein the manually operated extraction member cooperates with the mold sections to form a part of the part shape cavity, and a second position, wherein the manually operated extraction member is operative to engage and eject the stuck cast part from the stationary mold section of the part shape cavity. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests such an extraction device as recited in Claim 1.

U.S. Patent No. 3,807,682 to Catinella et al. discloses an accelerated knock-out (22) which, is actuated automatically during each cycle as part of the normal operation of the machine, so as to eject or knock out the molded part (17) from the moveable mold block (11) of the machine. It is pointed out that the Examiner on page 2 of the Official Action incorrectly identified mold section (12) in Catinella as being the moveable mold block, mold section (11) as being the stationary mold block, and that the extraction device (30) was in a cavity in the stationary mold block. The moveable mold block is identified by reference character (11), the stationary mold block is

identified by reference character (12), and the extraction device (30) or the knock-out, generally shown by reference character (22), is positioned in the moveable mold block (11). Thus, Catinella et al. only discloses that the automatic knock-out (22) is operative to eject a part from the moveable mold block (11) during the normal operation of the machine, i.e., during each cycle of the movement of the moveable block (11) of the machine. It is clear that the knock-out (22) in Catinella et al. would not operate or function for its intended purpose if the block (11), which is the moveable mold block of molding die, did not move during operation of the machine. There is no teaching or suggestion in Catinella et al. of providing a “knock-out” device for ejecting a stuck part from the stationary mold block, i.e., block (12) in Catinella et al. [It is noted that Catinella et al. at col. 2, lines 50-51 states that “cover plate 12 may be fixed or movable, as desired”; however, this would only mean that both mold block (11) and mold block (12) could be moveable in which case there would not be a stationary mold block.] In both constructions, it is clear that the extraction device (22) disclosed in Catinella et al. only functions for its intended purpose if the extraction device (22) is in the moveable mold block, i.e., mold block (11). For example, see col. 2, lines 11-15 where it states that “A still further object of this invention is to provide an accelerated knock-out structure, which is returned quickly and positively to an initial condition solely as a result of the moving components of the die, thus eliminating the use of return springs and the like.” Thus, Catinella et al. does not disclose or suggest a knock-out/extraction member which can be operated when it is desired to remove a stuck cast part from the stationary mold block of the machine, i.e., mold block (12) in Catinella et al., as recited in Claim 1. The present invention clearly relates to an extraction member which can be operated to remove a stuck cast part from the stationary mold section of the casting apparatus. Specifically, Claim 1 recites that the manually operated extraction member is disposed in the stationary mold section during the casting of a cast part and is selectively moveable between a first position, wherein the manually operated extraction member cooperates with the mold sections to form a part of the part shape cavity, and a second position, wherein the manually operated extraction member is operative to engage and eject the stuck cast

part from the stationary mold section of the part shape cavity. Thus, it is believed that Claim 1, along with dependent Claims 2-4 and 12-13, are patentable over the cited references.

Claim 5 has been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1. Thus, for those reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1, it is believed that Claim 5, along with dependent Claims 6 and 14-16, are patentable over the prior art references.

Claim 7 has been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1. Thus, for those reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1, it is believed that Claim 7, along with dependent Claims 8-11 and 17-20, are patentable over the prior art references.

In paragraph 4 of the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 3, 6, 8 and 10 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,807,682 to Catinella et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,245,277 to Diamond. It is believed that these dependent claims are patentable for those reasons discussed above with respect to their respective independent claims.

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance.